THE LIMITS OF THE HERESIOLOGICAL ETHOS IN LATE ANTIQUITY

Michel-Yves Perrin

Abstract

A catechumen would be inculcated with a true heresiological ethos intended to arm him or her against the seductions of doctrinal adversaries of the Christian community into which they were now to enter. This was not just about an intellectual 'flight from heresy', but also about renouncing all physical contact with heretics. This study considers the difficulties surrounding the creation of this ethos in the course of the doctrinal controversies of the third to fifth c.

Eusebius of Caesarea relates an interesting story about Origen. As his father had just suffered martyrdom at the very beginning of the 3rd c. A.D., the teenager was taken in by a wealthy woman who 'was very attentive to a man who was famous among the heretics living in Alexandria at that time', an Antiochian named Paul:

> While an immense crowd was gathering around Paul (…) because of his eloquence—not only were there heretics but there were also some of us—, Origen never agreed to join him in his prayers, insisting from his early childhood onwards on preserving the rule of the Church and having, in his own terms, a horror of heretical doctrines.[1]

The point of this anecdote, which is tinged with hagiography, lies in the emphasis that is laid on Origen's precocious compliance with a heresiological ethos that other Christians, from the same Great Church, failed to respect. The tension created, in a Christian context, by these two contrasting standards of behaviour towards the doctrinal enemy is the topic of my paper. For the sake of chronological

[1] Euseb., *Hist. eccl.* 6.2.13–14: (…) καὶ τυγχάνει δεξιώσεως ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀναπαύσεως παρά τινι πλουσιωτάτῃ μὲν τὸν βίον καὶ τὰ ἄλλα περιφανεστάτῃ γυναικί, διαβόητόν γε μὴν ἄνδρα περιεπούσῃ τῶν τότε ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας αἱρεσιωτῶν · (…) μυρίου πλήθους διὰ τὸ δοκοῦν ἱκανὸν ἐν λόγῳ τοῦ Παύλου (…) συναγομένου παρ᾽ αὐτῷ οὐ μόνον αἱρετικῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμετέρων, οὐδεπώποτε προυτράπη κατ᾽ τὴν εὐχὴν αὐτῷ συστῆναι, φυλάττων ἐξ ἔτι παιδὸς κανόνα ἐκκλησίας βδελυττόμενος τε, ὡς αὐτῷ ῥήματι φησίν που αὐτός, τὰς τῶν αἱρέσεων διδασκαλίας.

D. Gwynn, S. Bangert (edd.) *Religious Diversity in Late Antiquity*
(Late Antique Archaeology 6 – 2008) (Leiden 2010), pp. 201–227

coherence, I have chosen to confine myself to the period from the beginning of the 3rd c. A.D. to the 430s. The reason for this choice is twofold. On the one hand, the 3rd c. can be considered, from the perspective of a contemporary historian using all available sources, as the starting point for the growing importance of crowds in the history of dogma-related debates. As I have mentioned elsewhere,[2] I take the monarchian crisis at the turn of the 3rd c. to mark the onset of this development. The choice of the closing date of the 430s, is, I must confess, more arbitrary. The death of Augustine and the early years of the Nestorian crisis do not actually mark a new stage in the history of Christian doctrinal conflicts, but these years are characterised by a huge increase in the available data and hence greater difficulty in encompassing phenomena which, more often than not, cannot be comprehended in our primary sources, except through anecdotes or barely mentioned episodes. The historian's task consists in attempting to recapture, in an incidental quotation or a passing reference, some fragments of 'micro-history' that reveal structural phenomena and anthropological homologies that enhance our understanding of the past.

Eusebius of Caesarea underlined Origen's concern that true Christians should not mix with heretics. That message was intended to demonstrate the Alexandrian's faithfulness to the canons of Christian behaviour regarding those who were defined as doctrinal adversaries by the Great Church. Whoever reads the baptismal catecheses of 4th or 5th c. preachers that have been preserved down to our times is bound to be struck by the hazards and the threats that heresy and heretics pose to the catechumens and the newly baptised. In the middle of the 4th c. A.D., the eighteen catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem appeared in the form of a genuine heresiological treatise: one recognises the names of Simon Magus, Cerinthus, Menander, Carpocrates, Ebion, Marcion, Basilides, Valentinus, Montanus, Sabellius and at great length Mani; while, anonymously, the Arians are also mentioned. The function of these catecheses is clearly defined thus:

> You are given weapons against the Adversary's action; you receive weapons against heresies, against Jews, Samaritans, and Pagans. You have a lot of enemies, so receive a lot of ammunition. For you fight many, and

[2] Perrin (2001) 179–85.

> you need to learn how to fell the Pagan, how to fight the heretic, the Jew and the Samaritan.[3]

Right from the start the catechesis is placed under the aegis of a fight against Evil: baptism is, after all, supposed to wrench the neophyte from the power of Darkness, and the exorcisms that mark the catechumen's first steps foreshadow this struggle. The catechesis aims at defining an orthodox doctrinal identity on the dual basis of a *pars destruens* and a *pars construens*. Cyril seeks to define the limits and bounds of the 'Righteous Faith' by emphasising what stands outside it. These outsiders are categorised under the classical trilogy of Jews, pagans and heretics, to which are added here, on account of the local context, the Samaritans. At the same time, it was also necessary to provide the catechumens with the means to defend that 'Righteous Faith'. Epiphanius of Salamis, Theodore of Mopsuestia, John Chrysostom at Antioch as at Constantinople, Nicetas of Remesiana and Augustine of Hippo all offer further evidence of how important doctrinal polemic was, as early as the middle of the 4th c. at the latest, in a catechumen's training.

This insistence on the righteousness of the faith and its contents and on the groups that are said to threaten it is intended to instil into catechumens what, in a speech to his Constantinople congregation in 380, Gregory Nazianzen calls a διαγνωστικὴ ἕξις, 'an ability to distinguish a familiar voice from an alien one'.

> These sheep, he calleth them by name (cf. John 10:3) for they are not anonymous (…), and these sheep follow me, because I lead them to green pastures beside the still waters (cf. Psalm 22.2); they also follow every such shepherd, and look how pleased they are to hear his voice; but "a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him" (John 10:5), because they have, from now on, an ability to distinguish their shepherd's voice from that of a stranger. They will run away from the division of the One into two, as Valentinus taught.…[4]

---

[3] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Proc.* 10: ὅπλα γὰρ λαμβάνεις κατὰ ἀντικειμένης ἐνεργείας · ὅπλα λαμβάνεις κατὰ αἱρέσεων, κατὰ Ἰουδαίων, καὶ Σαμαρειτῶν, καὶ Ἐθνῶν · πολλοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἔχεις, πολλὰ βέλη λάμβανε. πρὸς πολλοὺς γὰρ ἀκοντίζεις. Καὶ χρεία σοι μαθεῖν πῶς κατακοντίσῃς τὸν Ἕλληνα, πῶς ἀγωνίσῃ πρὸς αἱρετικὸν, πρὸς Ἰουδαίον καὶ Σαμαρείτην ·

[4] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 33.16: Ταῦτα (scil. Τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμά) καλῶ κατ᾽ ὄνομα—οὐκ ἀνώνυμα γάρ (…)—καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσι μοι, ἐκτρέφω γὰρ ἐπὶ ὕδατος ἀναπαύσεως · ἀκολουθοῦσι δὲ καὶ παντὶ τοιούτῳ ποιμένι, οὗ τὴν φωνὴν ὁρᾶτε, ὅπως ἡδέως ἤκουσαν · "ἀλλοτρίῳ δὲ οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσωσιν, ἀλλὰ φεύξονται ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ", ὅτι διαγνωστικὴν ἕξιν ἔχουσιν ἤδη φωνῆς οἰκείας καὶ ἀλλοτρίας. Φεύξονται Οὐαλεντίνου τὴν τοῦ ἑνος εἰς δύο κατατομήν κτλ.

Gregory thus rejoices in his success in introducing into both the ears and the minds of his audience not only a 'doctrinal susceptibility' but also a genuine heresiological ethos which will shape their behaviour and, at the same time, their faith. All he did, after all, was to stir up an essential disposition that baptismal catecheses endeavour to promote and nurture in every would-be baptised Christian, and which ordinary preaching, as shall be seen later, was designed to maintain and exercise.

In all the instructions delivered to both the catechumens and the faithful, the injunction to 'run away from heretics' rings out distinctly: not only is this a merely intellectual rejection of opinions, ideas or beliefs considered to be wrong, but true believers must protect themselves from any physical contact with the people who champion them. Similarly, Cyril of Jerusalem urges his would-be baptised Christians to renounce the use of astrology or any predictive device, to avoid intemperance, to refuse to attend any entertainment in the society of pagans, to avoid the use of amulets (such as ligatures) in case of illness, to stay away from Judaism and the religion of Samaritans and 'especially to hate the gatherings of criminal heretics'.[5] John Chrysostom, Augustine and Theodore of Mopsuestia say exactly the same thing.[6] Cyril of Jerusalem then goes further and proclaims:

> Let us hate those who are worthy of hate; let us turn our backs on the ones from whom God turns away; let us also tell God about the heretics: "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee; and am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee?" (Psalm 138:21). For there exists some beautiful enmity, as it is written: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed" (Genesis 3:15).[7]

---

[5] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 4.37: Φεῦγε δὲ πᾶσαν διαβολικὴν ἐνέργειαν (…). Καὶ μήτε ἀστρολογίαις, μήτε ὀρνεοσκοπίαις, μήτε κληδόσι πρόσεχε, μηδὲ ταίς μυθώδεσι τῶν Ἑλλήνων μαντείαις. Φαρμακίαν, καὶ ἐπαοιδίαν, καὶ τὰ νεκυομαντειῶν παρανομώτατα πράγματα, μηδὲ μέχρις ἀκοῆς παραδέχου. Ἀπόστηθι παντὸς ἀκολασίας εἴδους, μήτε γαστριμαργῶν, μήτε φληδονῶν, ὑπεράνω τε φλαργυρίας ἁπάσης καὶ τοῦ τοκίζειν γενόμενος. Μήτε δὲ θεωριῶν ἐθνικοίς ἀθροίσμασι παράβαλλε · μήτε ἐπιδέσμασιν ἐν νόσοις χρήσῃ ποτέ. Ἀποστρέφου δὲ πᾶσαν καὶ τοῦ καπηλοδυτείν χυδαιότητα. Καὶ μήτε εἰς Σαμαρειτισμὸν ἢ Ἰουδαισμὸν ἐκπέσης · ἐλυτρώσατο γάρ σε λοιπὸν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός. Πάσης σαββάτων παρατηρήσεως ἀπόστηθι · καὶ τοῦ κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν τι εἶναι τῶν ἀδιαφόρων βρωμάτων. Ἐξαιρέτως δὲ μίσει πάντα τὰ συνέδρια τῶν παρανόμων αἱρετικῶν. Cf. also 15.33 and 16.10.

[6] John Chrysostom, *Bapt. cat.* 1.24; August., *Serm.* 56.12 and 14; 88.17; 215.9; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Hom. cat.* 13 *passim*.

[7] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 16.10: μισήσωμεν τοὺς μίσους ἀξίους, ἀποστραφῶμεν οὓς ἀποστρέφεται ὁ θεός. Εἴπωμεν καὶ αὐτοὶ μετὰ παρρησίας πάσης τῷ θεῷ περὶ

Although he refuses to give into hatred, Gregory Nazianzen invites his congregation to move away from his adversaries as they are 'a blemish for the Church and a poison for the Truth'.[8] Such exhortations are no novelty. In the 3rd c. A.D. the *Didascalia of the Apostles*, a book of Syrian origin which deals with canonical and liturgical matters, already forbade any contact with 'heretics': no communication was possible with them, either by word, or through prayer.[9] At the beginning of the 2nd c., as it seems, the author of the Epistle to Titus 3.10–11 gave this advice: 'A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject; Knowing that he that is such subverted and sinneth being condemned of himself'.[10] Throughout his correspondence Cyprian of Carthage gives numerous examples of this principle of the excommunication of the adversary[11] and offers an anthology of scriptural *dicta probantia* to support and illustrate it in a letter to one of his fellow bishops in 256:[12] II Corinthians 6:14 ('Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?'); II Timothy 2:17 ('And their word will eat as doth a canker'); and I John 4:3 ('And every spirit that divideth Jesus is not of God and this is that spirit of Antichrist whereof ye have heard that he should come and even now already is it in the world').

The Donatists were the ones who went the furthest in scrutinising the Scriptures in order to extract verses which gave legitimacy to their hostility towards their adversaries. The verses they gathered included: Proverbs 9:18b (in a version inspired from the Septuagint: 'Of an alien water, thou shalt abstain, and from an alien spring thou shalt not

---

πάντων αἱρετικῶν · οὐχὶ τοὺς μισοῦντάς σε κύριε ἐμίσησα καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ἐξετηκόμην; ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ἔχθρα καλή, καθὼς γέγραπται · καὶ ἔχθραν θήσω ἀνὰ μέσον σου καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς.

[8] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 36.10: τοὺς δὲ ἄλλο τι φρονοῦντας ἢ λέγοντας, ἢ φύσων μέτροις τὸ ἓν διαλύοντας, ἢ διατειχίζοντας, ὡς λύμην τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἰόν, ἀποπέμποισθε, μὴ μισοῦντες, ἀλλ΄ ἐλεοῦντες τοῦ πτώματος.

[9] *Didascalia Apostolorum* 25. Cf. also 15 and 26. On prohibiting talking to 'heretics', see also Irenaeus of Lyons, *Adv. haer.* 3.3.4, and Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 6.19 and 33.

[10] *Epistula ad Titum* 3:10–11: αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἐξέστραπται ὁ τοιοῦτος καὶ ἁμαρτάνει ὢν αὐτοκατάκριτος. See Le Boulluec (1985) 524 ff., and Augustine's commentary on this scriptural verse (*Ep.* 43.1; cf. *PCBE* 1, Eleusius) in his correspondence with Donatists.

[11] Cyprian, *Ep.* 34.1.1; 41.2.1–2; 42; 43.7.2, etc.; Cyprian, *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate* 23: *recedendum est a delinquentibus uel immo fugiendum, ne dum quis male ambulantibus iungitur, et per itinera erroris et criminis graditur, a uia ueri itineris exerrans, pari crimine et ipse teneatur.*

[12] Cyprian, *Ep.* 73.15. 1–2 (see the comment in the edition by Clarke (1984–1989)).

drink'); I Timothy 5:22 ('Neither be partaker of other men's sins'); Isaiah 52:11 ('Depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from thence; touch no unclean thing'); Leviticus 21:4–6 (in an abridged version: 'whoever has touched an unclean thing becomes unclean'); and I Corinthians 5:6 ('Know thee not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?').[13]

The phrase 'no salvation outside the Church' which Origen and Cyprian coined at almost the same time, the former against the Jews, the latter against the 'heretics',[14] and which was to be widely circulated,[15] is here achieved through the rejection of all ritual blemish.[16] The instances of genuine horror at the pollution entailed by any contact with heretics, which Paul Monceaux considered as a particularly Donatist characteristic,[17] are echoed by similar passages from other times or places within the *orbis christianus* of that period. The so-called 'Council of Laodicea' canons, an ecclesiastical body of laws that allegedly appeared in Asia Minor in the second half of the 4th c. or at the beginning of the 5th, not only insist that prayer should not be carried out in common with heretics and schismatics (which implies not attending their cemeteries and martyria), but also that Christians should stay away from their celebrations, turn down their offerings and

---

[13] These scriptural references are quoted in a letter from Augustine (*Ep.* 108.1 and 7) to Macrobius, the Donatist bishop of Hippo in the early 410s (*PCBE* 1, Macrobius 2; cf. Lancel (1999) 352 and 416). The same case is also mentioned in *De unico baptismo* 14.24. The quotation, presented as scriptural (*Qui tetigerit pollutum pollutus est*), which refers to Leviticus 21:4–6, seems to be linked to Leviticus 5:2; Numbers 19:22 and Haggai 2:14 (cf. Optatus of Milevis 6.3.1 and 7). The quotation from Proverbs 9:18 (70) finds an echo, as far as its meaning is concerned, in Cyprian, *Ep.* 69.2.

[14] Origen *Hom. in Jos.* 3.5 (*Nemo ergo sibi persuadeat, nemo semet ipsum decipiat: extra hanc domum, id est extra ecclesiam, nemo saluatur; si quis foras exierit, mortis suae ipse fit reus*; see the edition by Jaubert (1960) 142–43, n. 1, who opposes Harnack in defending the Origenian origin of the passage): see Ledegang (2001) 291–302 and 677; Cyprian, Ep. 73.21.2 (*Salus extra ecclesiam non est)*; cf. 55.24.1 *(Quisquis ille est et qualiscumque est, christianus non est qui in Christi ecclesia non est*); 66.2.2; 72.2.3. Cf. Bévenot (1981); Le Boulluec (1985) 482–84. Unfortunately I have not been able to consult M. Kessler, "*Extra ecclesiam nulla salus?* Zur Problematik einer Denkfigur", in *Kirche sein. Nachkonziliare Theologie im Dienst der Kirchenreform. Festschrift H. J. Pottmeyer*, edd. W. Geerlings and M. Seckter (Freiburg 1994) 295–331.

[15] See Ratzinger (1971) 145–71; Rahner (1964) 538–47 (on the patristic interpretation of Noah's Ark); Kern (1995).

[16] Douglas (2001) provides an interesting analysis of this concept. Cf. Parker (1983). Penn (2003) has beautifully illustrated this particular outlook by highlighting the role of the acceptance or refusal of the kiss of peace in some cases of division among Christians in Late Antiquity. Cf. Penn (2005).

[17] Monceaux (1912) 171–73. Let it be recalled, once and for all, that Donatists and Anti-Donatists would often condemn each other not only as 'schismatics' but also as 'heretics': see Greenslade (1964) and Tilley (2007).

not marry their offspring.[18] All these provisions result from a deeply rooted jurisprudence whose elements were collected by the great Joseph Bingham in the sixteenth Book of his *Origines Ecclesiasticae*.[19] These conditions follow a principle that, at the beginning of the 5th c., Synesius of Cyrene states with such rare clarity that it makes all gloss redundant: 'The blemish can be passed on from the one to the other, and when one has touched the unclean thing, one incurs the curse of Heaven. Now one must, both spiritually and physically, stand clean before God'.[20]

If the baptismal catecheses that have come down to us do not display all the nuances of the physical rejection of 'heretics' that have just been illustrated, there is no doubt that the anthropological structures that support them were widely shared by people in ancient times whatever their cults or their beliefs. One classical example will be enough. Polybius relates that after the Third Macedonian War and Perseus' defeat at Pydna in 168 B.C., the Achaean politicians (notably the *strategos* Callicrates and his friends) who were in favour of an unconditional surrender to Rome's demands were utterly hated by most of their fellow-countrymen. To support his words, Polybius mentions the following anecdote:

> When the festival of the Antigoneia was being celebrated in Sicyon, and all the baths had their large public bathing-tubs open, and smaller ones next to them, which the more genteel people used to enter privately whenever any of the party of Callicrates and Andronidas went in to them, none of those who were waiting their turn ventured to enter the water after them, before the bath-keeper had let it all run off and poured

[18] *Canons of Laodicea*, c. 6.9–10, 31–34, and 37.

[19] On excluding heretics: *Canons of Antioch*, c. 2; *Apostolic Constitutions* 6.18; 8.47.46; 8.47.65; 8.47.68; Epiph., *De fide* 24.3. On the refusal of offerings from 'heretics' or excommunicated people: Tert., *Adv. Marc.* 4.4.3 (The Roman Church gave Marcion his money back after his excommunication); *Didascalia Apostolorum* 18; *Canons of Elvira*, c. 28. On denying marriage: *Canons of Elvira*, c. 16; *Breviarium Hipponense* (pertaining to the Council of Carthage in 397), c. 12. Cf. Bingham (1845) vol. VII, 16.2–3, and vol. IX, 21.2, of which a very brief but convenient synthesis can be found in Smith and Cheetham (1876) 766–69.

[20] Synesius of Cyrene, *Ep.* 42: Ὁ γὰρ μολυσμὸς διαδόσιμος γίνεται, καὶ ὁ θίγων ἐναγοῦς ἀπολαύει τῆς τροπῆς. Δεί δὲ εἶναι καὶ γνώμῃ καὶ σώματι καθαροὺς τῷ θεῷ. On the event that motivated this declaration by Synesius—the excommunication of Governor Andronikos—see Teja (1997); De Salvo (1998) and Schmitt (1998), all of which were ignored by the editor, D. Roques.

> in fresh. They did this because they considered that they would be, as it were, polluted by entering the same water as those people.[21]

According to a tradition that Irenaeus of Lyons claims to have inherited from Polycarp of Smyrna, the Apostle John does not seem to have behaved very differently towards his adversary, Cerinthus. 'As John, the Lord's disciple, arrived at the baths in Ephesus, he noticed that Cerinthus was inside; so he rushed out of the building, without having bathed, shouting "Let us run away, for fear the baths may collapse, for there inside is Cerinthus, the enemy of Truth"'.[22]

This cutting remark was to remain famous.[23] Theodoret relates that in Samosata, after Eusebius, the Nicene bishop, had been sent into exile under emperor Valens, the faithful refused by all possible means to hold communion with the newly appointed bishop, a man called Eunomius, a good man but one who was hostile to the Nicene Creed.

> On one occasion he had expressed a wish to bathe, so his servants shut the doors of the bath, and kept out all who wished to come in. When he saw the crowd before the doors he ordered them to be thrown open, and directed that everyone should freely use the bath. He exhibited the same conduct in the halls within; for on observing certain men standing by him when he bathed, he begged them to share the hot water with him. They stood silent. Thinking their hesitation was due to a respect for him, he quickly arose and made his way out, but these people had really been of the opinion that even the water was affected with the pollution of his heresy, and so sent it all down the sinks, while they ordered a fresh supply to be provided for themselves. On being informed of this the intruder departed from the city, for he judged that it was insensate

[21] Polyb. 30.29: τῆς γὰρ τῶν Ἀντιγονείων πανηγύρεως ἐν τῷ Σικυῶνι συντελουμένης, καὶ τῶν βαλανείων ἁπάντων ἐχόντων τάς τε κοινὰς μάκτρας καὶ πυέλους ταύταις παρακειμένας, εἰς ἃς οἱ κομψότεροι τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰώθασι κατ᾽ ἰδίαν ἐμβαίνειν, εἰς ταύτας ὅτε τις καθείη τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἀνδρονίδαν καὶ Καλλικράτην, οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα τῶν ἐφεστώτων ἔτι καθιέναι, πρὶν ἢ τὸν βαλανείτην τὸ μὲν ὑπάρχον ὕδωρ ἀφείναι πᾶν, ἕτερον δὲ καθαρὸν ἐγχέαι. τοῦτο δ᾽ ἐποίουν, ὑπολαμβάνοντες ὡσανεὶ μιαίνεσθαι καθίεντες εἰς ταὐτὸ τοῖς προειρημένοις ὕδωρ. For an archaeological discussion of this passage, see Thébert (2003) 55 n. 36.

[22] Irenaeus of Lyons, *Adv. haer.* 3.3.4: Καὶ εἰσὶν οἱ ἀκηκοότες αὐτοῦ ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητὴς ἐν τῇ Ἐφέσῳ πορευθεὶς λούσασθαι καὶ ἰδὼν ἔσω Κήρινθον ἐξήλατο τοῦ βαλανείου μὴ λουσάμενος, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπειτών · φύγωμεν, μὴ καὶ τὸ βαλανείον συμπέσῃ, ἔνδον ὄντος Κηρίνθου τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθροῦ.

[23] See Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* 3.28.6; 4.14.6; Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Haer. Fab. compendium* 2.3. Epiph., *Pan.* 30.24 substitutes Ebion for Cerinthus.

> and absurd on his part to continue to reside in a city which detested him, and treated him as a common foe.[24]

The purpose of these *exempla*—which, to my knowledge, have never been put together before—is to underline both the clear continuity of behaviour in this succession of sources and the strength of the common feeling of repulsion for uncleanness, be it either political or doctrinal. Other testimonies may be called upon here in order to illustrate the power of a sort of in-built διαγνωστικη ἕξις. If, according to her biographer Gerontius, Melania the Younger 'heard that someone was a heretic—or was merely reported to be one—she would exhort them to convert to God'. If the heretic would not allow herself to be persuaded, 'she did not even accept anything from them for helping the poor'.[25] The women whose spiritual adviser was Jerome show a similar attitude. Eustochium, for example, after the Bethlehem monastery had been burnt down in 416, preferred to give up her family wealth and her houses and be sent into an honourable exile, rather than 'be sullied by the communion of heretics'.[26] The

---

[24] Theodoret of Cyrrrhus, *Hist. Eccl.* 4.15.2–3: Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ λούσασθαι βουληθέντος οἱ οἰκέται τοῦ βαλανείου τὰς θύρας ἔκλεισαν τοὺς εἰσελθεῖν βουλομένους κωλύοντες, πλῆθος πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν θεασάμενος ἀναπετάσαι ταύτας ἐκέλευσε, καὶ ἀδεῶς τοῦ λουτροῦ τοὺς πάντας κοινωνῆσαι προσέταξε. Ταὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἔνδον ἐν τοίς θόλοις πεποίηκε. Λουομένῳ γὰρ αὐτῷ παρεστηκότας ἰδών, συμμετασχείν τῶν θερμῶν ὑδάτων ἐκέλευσεν· οἱ δὲ σιγῶντες εἰστήκεισαν. Ὁ δὲ τιμὴν τὴν στάσιν ὑπολαβών, θᾶττον ἀναβὰς ἐξελήλυθεν. Οἱ δὲ τοῦ τῆς αἱρέσεως ἄγους καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ μετεσχηκέναι νομίσαντες, ἐκεῖνο μὲν τοίς ὑπονόμοις παρέπεμψαν, ἕτερον δὲ αὐτοίς κερασθῆναι προσέταξαν. τοῦτο μαθὼν ἐκεῖνος ᾤχετο τὴν πόλιν καταλιπών, πόλιν οἰκείν ἀπεχθανομένην καὶ κοινὴν δυσμένειαν ἔχουσαν ἀβέλτερον εἶναι νομίσας καὶ λίαν ἀνόητον.

[25] Gerontius, *Vita Melaniae* 27: ὥστε εἴ τινα κἂν ψιλῷ τῷ ὀνόματι αἱρετικὸν ἤκουεν, εἰ μὲν συμβουλευούση αὐτῷ μεταβαλέσθαι ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον ἐπείθετο <?> εἰ δὲ μή γε, οὔτε εἰς οἰκονομίαν τῶν πτωχῶν λαβείν τι παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ κατεδέχετο. (cf. the Donatists' refusal of Macarius' alms: Optatus of Milevis 3.3.2). In § 28, Melania refuses holy communion because the diptychs of the dead mention a woman who has just died and who is believed to be a 'heretic'. On the other hand, in § 29, Melania converts Samaritans, pagans and heretics by resorting to special gifts and exhortations. In § 44 Melania, then in the middle of the Nestorian crisis, is depicted as exhorting virgins to seek 'orthodoxy' first (cf. Antony's last speech, Athanasius, *Vit. Ant.* 89.4 and 91.4). On Melania, see Giardina (1994) and *PCBE* 2, Melania 2; see also the comments of Laurence in the edition of the Latin *vita*, on pp. 29–76 (the author's conclusion is—on 141— that both the Greek and Latin versions of the *Vita* represent "two recensions that are very probably contemporaneous with the primitive *Vita* of Gerontius". Of the passages examined here, only § 27 differs from the Greek text of the *Vita*). In Cappadocian Caesarea, when emperor Valens attended Basil's mass for Epiphany, nobody helped him to bring his offering to the altar (Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 43.52).

[26] See respectively Jer., *Ep.* 108.23–25; 127.9–10; 154.2. See Krumeich (1993); Rebenich (1992) with Duval (1995); Paoli (1994), and especially *PCBE* 2, Paula 1, Marcella 1, and Eustochium.

rigorous Roman priests Faustinus and Marcellinus pay tribute to the *plebs sancta* of Oxyrhynchus and to Hermione, a virgin of Eleutheropolis, who repelled the communion of 'heretics'.[27] Similarly, it is not uncommon to encounter cases in which priests or bishops refuse to be ordained by bishops whose orthodoxy seems suspicious. Aetius refused to be made a bishop by Secundus and Serra as they were suspected of compromising with homoousians, for they had been ordained by homoousians themselves,[28] while the same attitude can be seen among the 'old Nicenes' and their allies in relation to Meletius of Antioch. The Donatist crisis began with the disputed election of Caecilian of Carthage, and the contemporary Melitian schism in Egypt reflected the same concerns. Already at the time of the pagan persecutions, the imprisoned Egyptian Christians are said to have taken care to separate themselves from those among their fellow Christians who did not belong to the same communion. Epiphanius thus relates that Peter of Alexandria hung a coat in his jail to separate his own followers from those of Meletius of Lycopolis, and that when working at the mines the two groups would never receive Communion or pray together.[29]

To these accounts, which may not always be accurate or truthful but which are nonetheless plausible and reflect a generally accepted system of values, some first-hand testimonies can be added which illustrate a similar preoccupation with orthodoxy. The Roman aristocrat Anicia Iuliana, mother of Demetrias, vigorously opposed Augustine and Alypius, who suspected her of having Pelagian sympathies, and she insisted that both her family's faith and her own were righteous:

---

[27] Faustinus and Marcellinus, *Libellus precum* 93 and 103. About these events, see Simonetti (1963) 76–77 and Simonetti (2001) 21–24. Cf. Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.17.4: During Pope Liberius' exile no one would go to church when Felix, his substitute, officiated.

[28] Philostorgius 3.19; Sozom. 6.38 (the monk Moses refused to be made bishop of the Saracens by Lucius, the anti-Nicene bishop of Alexandria; cf. Rufinus of Aquileia, *Hist. Eccl.* 11.6; Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Hist. Eccl.* 4.23.2).

[29] Epiph., *Pan.* 68.3.3 and 9. See Martin (1996) 267–85 (the narrative does not seem totally reliable). Epiphanius' account can be compared with two passages from *Passio Donati* 11.1 (*Nam cum Montanus cum Iuliano habuisset sermones aliquos ob eam mulierem quae ad nostram communionem obrepsit, cui non communicabat, cumque post correptionem quam in eum ingesserat in frigore ipse discordiae mansisset* etc.) and 14.3 (*Haereticorum quoque superbam et inprobam contumaciam retundebat, contestans eos ut uel de copia martyrum intellegerent ecclesiae ueritatem ad quam redire deberent*) which evoke a similar situation of imprisonment and the arguments it raised among Donatist prisoners. In relation to this background one would find it interesting to read the narrative of the martyrdom of Pionios of Smyrna and his companions, see *Martyrium Pionii*.

> Please note that me and my household are very far away from people of that kind. Our family's attachment to the Catholic faith is such that we have never gone astray and fallen into heresy; I am not only speaking of those vagabond sects, but I also mean those that seem to contain only a few minor errors.[30]

Heresiological anxiety also shows itself in correspondence addressed to religious figures who are considered to have genuine authority in the matter of orthodoxy, such as Augustine or Jerome, and in which we find either requests for clarification or reports about some suspicious speech or document.[31] Indeed cases of this kind abound.

All these fragments of 'micro-history' testify to the resonance of a heresiological ethos. For lack of space it is not possible here to give a detailed and comprehensive account of the requirements that defined how this ethos was to be inculcated and perpetually maintained.

---

[30] August., *Ep.* 188.3 (Augustine and Alypius quote Iuliana's words): *Sed nouerit sacerdotium uestrum longe me ac domunculam meam ab huius modi personis esse discretam; omnis familia nostra adeo catholicam sequitur fidem, ut in nullam haeresim aliquando deuiauerit nec umquam lapsa sit, non dico in eas sectas, quae uix expiantur, sec nec in eas, quae paruos habere uidentur errores.* The answer of both correspondents is eloquent (§ 10): *de hoc ergo eius affectu utrum non fallamur, inde nos fac potius rescribendo certiores: nam illud optime nouimus cum omnibus uestris cultores uos esse et fuisse indiuiduae trinitatis; sed non hinc solum error humanus obrepit, ut aliquid secus sentiatur de indiuidua trinitate. Sunt enim et alia, in quibus perniciosissime erratur, sicuti hoc est, unde diutius fortasse, quam satis esset uestrae fideli castaeque prudentiae, in hac epistula locuti sumus.* Cf. Prosper of Aquitaine *apud* August., *Ep.* 225.8: *ac primum, quia plerique non putant christianam fidem hac dissensione uiolari, quantum periculi sit in eorum persuasione, patefacias.*

[31] See what Jerome writes (*Ep.* 141) to Augustine: *Catholici te conditorem antiquae rursum fidei uenerantur atque suscipiunt, et (quod signum maioris gloriae est) omnes haeretici detestantur.* We can relate this praise to Jerome's letter (*Ep.* 153) to Boniface, the bishop of Rome (418–22), shortly after his election: *Sentiant heretici inimicum te esse perfidi et oderint, ut a catholicis plus ameris, et executor atque completor sis sententiae praecessorum tuorum nec patiaris in episcopali nomine hereticorum patronos atque consortes.* See also what Augustine writes to Jerome, whom he asks about the question of the origin of the soul (*Ep.* 166.1; cf. O'Connell (1987); Clark (1992) 227–43): *Deum nostrum qui nos vocauit in suum regnum et gloriam, et rogaui et rogo ut hoc quod ad te scribo, sancte frater Hieronyme, consulens te de his quae nescio, fructuosum esse nobis uelit. Quamquam enim te multo quam ego sum aetate maiorem, tamen etiam ipse iam senex consulo: sed ad discendum quod opus est, nulla mihi aetas sera uideri potest; quia etsi senes magis decet docere quam discere, magis tamen discere quam quid doceant ignorare. Nihil equidem molestius fero in omnibus angustiis meis quas patior in difficillimis quaestionibus, quam in tam longinquo tuae caritatis absentiam, ut uix possim meas dare, uix recipere litteras tuas, per interualla, non dierum, non mensium, sed aliquot annorum; cum, si fieri posset, quotidie praesentem te habere uellem, cum quo loquerer quidquid uellem. Nec ideo tamen non debui facere quod potui, si non potui totum quod uolui.* This can be compared with what Augustine (*Ep.* 202A.1–4) wrote to Optatus, a bishop of unknown see, who had asked him about the same issue and whom he told that he was expecting an answer due to come from the East—Jerome is not actually mentioned. On the Augustine-Jerome correspondence see Fürst (1999); Fürst (2002). On Optatus, see *PCBE* 1, Optatus 7.

But certain essential points should be emphasised. One should first mention how conspicuous discord was when it affected the Christian community and generated mockery or hostile questioning, especially among non-Christians. This prompted John Chrysostom to imagine the following little scene:

> A pagan introduces himself and says: 'I want to become a Christian. But I do not know which party to join. There is among you all so much battle and sedition, so much trouble. Which doctrine shall I follow? What choice shall I make? Everyone says: "I am the one who tells the truth" '.[32]

If the διαφωνία of those who claimed to follow Christ could be considered as a stumbling block for adhering to the Christian faith, then an attempt to account for these internal divisions seems, at first sight, an apologetic necessity, particularly when it concerns the education of the future baptised. In addition, under Constantine, the notions of 'heresy', 'schism', and the correlative notion of 'orthodoxy' that can be implied by the adjective 'Catholic' all found their way into public law.[33] "Beliefs enter into the scope of the law, which represents a major change in the history of the Western world".[34] This marks the beginning of what may be called an 'imperial orthodoxy'

---

[32] John Chrysostom, *In Acta Apost. hom.* 33.4: Τί οὖν ἂν εἴποιμεν πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας; Ἔρχεται Ἕλλην καὶ λέγει ὅτι βούλομαι γενέσθαι χριστιανὸς, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ οἶδα τίνι προσθῶμαι · μάχη παρ᾽ ὑμίν πολλὴ καὶ στάσις, πολὺς θόρυβος · ποίον ἕλωμαι δόγμα; τί αἱρήσομαι; Ἕκαστος λέγει ὅτι ἐγὼ ἀληθεύω, κτλ.

[33] See Noethlichs (1971) with the reviews of Pekáry (1973) and Végh (1972). This book is the classic study of imperial legislation relating to heretics in the 4th c. A.D. An appendix (208–12) contains short, inadequate observations on the notion of 'orthodoxy' in legal texts. Unfortunately, the book is tainted by an astonishing decision to almost entirely omit the legislation of the anti-Nicene emperors Constantius II (58–59) and Valens (92–95). It is true that the drafters of the *Theodosian Code* have systematically eliminated nearly all explicit references to legislation in favour of anti-Nicenes, with the exception of *Cod. Theod.* 16.2.15 (360), which evokes a clause from the Council of Rimini (359), and of *Cod. Theod.* 16.1.4, a law passed by Valentinian II in 386 granting the supporters of the *Credo* of the same Council the right of assembly (cf. Noethlichs (1971) 122–23; Vaggione (2000) 348). Nonetheless, refusing to take into account the measures of anti-Nicene emperors is bound to prevent a full understanding of how imperial legislation against heretics worked. See also Humfress (2007) 167 and 215–68. On the notion of a 'Catholic Church' in the first Constantinian legislation, see Calderone (1962) 136–50 and Mazzarino (1962) 654–56, and also the precious, and little-known, appraisal given by Lemerle (1945) 97–98. For the further development of this notion, see Wipszycka (1996). Crifò (1999) provides an assessment of how Christian terms came to be used in imperial legislation, but, strangely enough, omits the semantic fields of 'heresy' and 'orthodoxy'.

[34] Beaucamp (2002) 345.

that would be subject to the alterations entailed either by the evolution of doctrinal disputes or the occasional meddling of sovereigns who were always liable to adjust their convictions. At the same time new religious offences appeared, a phenomenon caused by the intervention of the State in enforcing the unity of the Church,[35]—the *Reichskonzilien*, starting with those that took place in Arles (in the year 314) and Nicaea (in 325), illustrate this splendidly.[36] As a result, the same period saw the first evidence of a jurisprudence in the repression of 'heresies' and 'schisms' which had been given the status of crimes by the law of the empire that no one was allowed to ignore.[37] On the opponents of the doctrine of the imperial Church, the State could inflict various punishments, either individual or collective. The most frequent include: banning assemblies, confiscating the premises where meetings took place, ordering fines, proclaiming banishments or impeding the execution of wills.[38]

In addition, the thriving building activity in the ancient *orbis christianus* from the middle of the 310s onwards that followed the persecution carried out by Diocletian seems to have immediately triggered a struggle among different Christian groups for the control of the buildings that had just been constructed and which were intended for liturgical assembly.[39] This brought the Christians' discord to the fore throughout the empire, as is exemplified by the Donatist crisis.

---

[35] See Ch. Pietri's analyses in Pietri and Pietri (1995) 216, 229–45, 263–335, 357–98, 411–51; Pietri (1997A); Pietri (1997B); Pietri (1997C). See also Lizzi (1996).

[36] I borrow the phrase *Reichskonzilien* from E. Schwartz's famous dissertation (1921).

[37] If the Donatist crisis—amounting, in some respects, to a quarrel among archivists—was an occasion for the protagonists to refer more often than not to the decisions of the emperor or his representatives—cf., for instance, August., *Ep.* 105.12; 185.25; 204.3; *Serm.* 47.22; *In Ioh. Ev. tract.* 6.25, etc.—, and if the former *consularis* of Aemilia-Liguria, Ambrose of Milan, was indeed well acquainted with the current legislation (cf. *Ep.* 74.26; 75.12; 75a.3 et 16), then it is still striking to see Faustinus and Marcellinus, two rigid Nicene priests who had got up a petition against Damasus, the bishop of Rome in 383/384, praise the imperial laws against heretics so as to brush aside the accusations levelled by their adversary who appealed to the same texts to deal severely with them [cf. Faustinus and Marcellinus, *Libellus precum*, 2 and 83. As to the date, see Pietri (1976) 871–72, and *PCBE* 2, Faustinus 2 and Marcellinus 3]. All attempts at a palingenesis of imperial constitutions turn such sources to their advantage. For a later period see Cameron (2003) 482–83 (I am very grateful to Professor Averil Cameron for presenting me with an abstract of her study).

[38] See the synthesis of R. Delmaire in *Cod. Theod.* (2005) 69–79.

[39] See M. Y. Perrin, in Pietri and Pietri (1995) 596–97.

All these factors contributed, particularly in the cities, to require every Christian to define himself or herself by joining one of the different groups who claimed to be the true followers of Christ. Exercising one's heresiological discernment, however, was not always easy. Cyril of Jerusalem advised a catechumen who arrived in a strange town not to look for a κυριακόν, the meeting place of all Christians,—'since in all their heresies the impious insist on calling their dens κυριακά—, but for the church, and more precisely the 'Catholic church'.[40] This is echoed by Pacianus of Barcelona, who engaged in polemics with Novatians:

> Let us imagine me having just arrived today in a populous city and meeting Marcionites, disciples of Apelles, Cataphrygians and others in the same vein, and who go by the name of Christians. How then would I know where my people meet, if not by the epithet "Catholic"?[41]

The Donatist crisis demonstrates how misleading such self-confidence could be, as it is well known today with what passion the Donatists and their opponents fought over the adjective 'Catholic'. In a sermon delivered in 404, Augustine dwells on the case of the Donatist bishop of Calama (today the Algerian town of Guelma), a man called Crispinus, who was accused of being behind an act of aggression on the person of the anti-Donatist bishop, Possidius.[42] According to the minutes that are quoted by Augustine, Crispinus said to the proconsul: 'Hear me: I am not a heretic', and again 'I am a Catholic'.[43] And Possidius adds the following comment:

---

[40] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 18.26: κἂν ποτε ἐπιδημῇς ἐν πόλεσι, μὴ ἁπλῶς ἐξέταζε, ποῦ τοῦ κυριακόν ἐστι (καὶ γὰρ αἱ λοιπαὶ τῶν ἀσεβῶν αἱρέσεις κυριακὰ τὰ ἑαυτῶν σπήλαια καλείν ἐπιχειροῦσι), μηδέ ποῦ ἔστιν ἁπλῶς ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἀλλὰ ποῦ ἔστιν ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἰδικὸν ὄνομα τυγχάνει τῆς ἁγίας ταύτης καὶ μητρὸς ἡμῶν ἁπάτων. A remarkable parallel can be found in August., *Serm.* 46.31.

[41] Pacian of Barcelona, *Epistula I ad Sempronianum* 3.2: *Ego forte ingressus hodie populosam urbem, cum Marcionitas, cum Apelleiacos, Cataphrygas, Nouatianos et ceteros eiusmodi comperissem, qui se christianos uocarent, quo cognomine congregationem meae plebis agnoscerem, nisi catholica diceretur?* It is well known that the attribute *catholicus* is the core of Pacian's efforts to refute the Novatians' theses: cf. *ibid.* 3.3; 4.1 (*Nec tamen aestues, frater, christiano mihi nomen est, catholico uero cognomen. Illud me nuncupat, istud ostendit; hoc probor, inde significor*). The latter quotation was to be chosen in the 19th c. as an epigraph to the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*!

[42] August., *Serm.* 162A.8–12. On this affair, see *PCBE* 1, Crispinus 1.

[43] August., *Serm.* 162A.8: *Audi me, non sum haereticus; ibid.*, 10: *catholicus sum*. In *Ep.* 93.23, Augustine gives the following interpretation of how, according to him, the Donatists comprehend the attribute 'catholic': *catholicae nomen non ex totius orbis communione interpretaris sed ex obseruatione praeceptorum omnium diuinorum atque omnium sacramentorum.*

> Hence it became necessary for the Catholic bishop, after the withdrawal of the *defensor ecclesiae*, to introduce counter-arguments and convince him that he must be what he had denied being. If indeed he had remained discreet about this, the uneducated people might have believed that the Catholic bishop was actually a heretic since Crispinus denied being one, which would have resulted in an outrage as far as the weak-minded are concerned.[44]

Words were not the only things that were likely to confuse the heresiological landmarks of the faithful. In the course of his fifteenth baptismal catechesis, and in a commentary on the passage from the 2nd Epistle to the Thessalonians (2:3–12) announcing the reign of apostasy before Christ's Parousia, Cyril of Jerusalem cried out:

> Here is what Paul says. Today is the day of apostasy: the men have turned away from the righteous faith. Some proclaim the paternity of the Son; others dare say that Christ was brought to life from nothingness. And before, one could clearly see the heretics, but today the church is filled with undercover heretics. Indeed the people have wandered from the truth and they have got ears. If a speech shows great persuasion, they all listen to it with pleasure. If a speech urges them to be converted, then they run away. Most have turned away from righteous words and choose Evil instead of preferring Good. This is apostasy.[45]

In Cyril's eyes, the Arian crisis, which is here directly alluded to, represents a break within the history of Christian doctrinal divisions. The controversy appeared to mark the climax of heretical deception, since it was not characterised by the conflict of clearly distinct parties but ran right through the Great Church.

---

[44] Possidius, *Vita Augustini* 12.6: *Qui resultans, legibus praesentatus, cum apud proconsulem se negaret haereticum, oborta est necessitas ut illi, recedente ecclesiae defensore, a catholico episcopo resisteretur et conuinceretur eum esse quod se fuisse negauerat; quoniam, si ab eodem dissimularetur, forte catholicus episcopus ab ignorantibus haereticus crederetur, illos se quod erat negante, atque ita ex hac desidia infirmis scandalum nasceretur.* On the function of the *defensor ecclesiae*, "a legal representative (here, occasional), versed in law and with the best interests of the Church at heart", see Lancel (1996–2002) (the author's text needs correction on one point: Crispinus appears in court, not "before municipal magistrates" but before the proconsul). See also Frakes (2001).

[45] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 15.9: Ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Παῦλος. νῦν δὲ ἔστιν ἡ ἀποστασία. Ἀπέστησαν γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως. Καὶ οἱ μὲν υἱοπατορίαν καταγγέλουσιν, οἱ δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων εἰς τὸ εἶναι παρενεχθέντα λέγειν τολμῶσιν. Καὶ πρότερον μὲν ἦσαν φανεροὶ οἱ αἱρετικοὶ, νῦν δὲ πεπλήρωται ἡ ἐκκλησία κεκρυμμένων αἱρετικῶν. Ἀπέστησαν γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ κνήθονται τὴν ἀκοήν. Λόγος πιθανός, καὶ πάντες ἀκούουσιν ἡδέως. Λόγος ἐπιστροφῆς, καὶ πάντες ἀποστρέφονται. Ἀπέστησαν οἱ πλείστοι τῶν ὀρθῶν λόγων, καὶ μᾶλλον τὸ κακὸν αἱροῦνται ἢ τὸ ἀγαθὸν προαιροῦνται. Αὕτη τοίνυν ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποστασία κτλ.

Ephrem the Syrian, also writing in the middle of the 4th c., evoked a very similar situation. In the *madrâshê* known under the title of *Hymns against heresies*, he identified the groups that had separated themselves from the Great Church. Many of these groups were quite early, such as Manicheans, Marcionites, Bardesainites or the various Gnostic groups, and could be easily recognised on account of their discipline or the liturgical features they have gradually acquired. Ephrem distinguished these earlier groups from contemporary adversaries, namely Arians, Sabellians, Photinians, Messalians, Paulinians and others. The earlier groups are called by Ephrem 'the ones who are within' (*barrâyê*), whereas the later groups are referred to as 'those who are without' or *gawwâyê*. Here is his description of them:

> They were "bishops" within the churches,
> And some were presbyters and deacons,
> Others were scribes or lectors;
> Some belonged to the covenant;
> From the Church they have stolen the order
> Of the various kinds of ministry:
> Ordaining priests, baptizing,
> Celebrating the Eucharist, and teaching
> That our Lord has come, and will come again.
> Blessed is the One who holds all in Truth.[46]

If, at the heart of the debates that took place in the 4th c. and at the beginning of the 5th, Manicheans, Meletians, Donatists, Anti-Nicenes, Pneumatomachi, Apollinarists, Priscillianists, Jovinianists, Origenists, Pelagians and other such groups were liable to find themselves charged with deception by their opponents,[47] it was not, in most cases, because they actually had a cult of secrecy. It was simply because the wound caused by the controversies was still open and its lips had not yet

[46] Ephraem, *Hymn. adv. haer.* 22.21; translated by Griffith (1999A) 103. See also Griffith (1999); Griffith (2001) 402–405 and Russell (1994).

[47] See, for instance: on Manicheans: John Chrysostom, *In Ep. ad Hebr. hom.* 8.4; August., *Ep.* 236.1; *Serm.* 2.2; *Acta Archelai* 65.3; on Melitians: Athanasius, *Ep. fest.* 12.1; on Donatists: August., *Serm.* 296.14; on Anti-Nicenes: Ambrose, *Expositio Ev. sec. Lucam* 7.51; on Pneumatomachi: Basil, *Ep.* 263.2; on Apollinarists: Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.* 5.3.7; on Priscillianists: August., *Retract.* 2.60; *Ep.* 237.3; on Jovinianists: August., *Retract.* 2.22; on Origenists: Jer., *Ep.* 84.4; 97.2; on Pelagians: August., *Serm. Dolbeau* 30.5; *Ep.* 157.22; 186.29; 194.2; 200.2; Innocent I, *apud* August., *Ep.* 182.6; 183.2; Arnobius Junior, *Praed.* 88. Unfortunately no documentation that would enable access to the opinion of the defeated on this point has become available so far. See also Löhr (2000) 293–97.

healed. The chronological arguments of Cyril of Jerusalem and Ephrem should not be taken by the contemporary historian at face value, for it is not true that there was a tactical shift in the art of religious debate among Christians in the course of the 4th c. or that the world had seen the appearance of a sort of powerful 'Nicodemism' before the term had been coined.[48] But by the 4th c. the divisions resulting from the controversies held during the previous centuries had generally led to the formation of clearly distinguishable groups, whereas in the 3rd c., at the precise moment when a number of these divisions occurred, the outlines of the opposing communities were nothing if not blurred. Thus, in order to defend the African Churches' custom of considering invalid baptism given outside their communion, Cyprian of Carthage continually emphasised the fact that the Novatians indeed had everything in common with their opponents—the same law, the same symbol, the same trinity—, but that they lacked the Holy Ghost.[49] The problem that Cyprian faced is what modern writers have called 'internal heresy'[50] or, to use Augustine's phrase (which he applied in 416 to the 'novel heresy' of Pelagius and his followers), the uncertain time when 'the separation of the Church is not yet manifest'.[51]

From the 4th c. onwards judgment in heresiological matters was to be very difficult for the faithful, and the risks of confusion would abound. This is the reason why Flavian, the bishop of Antioch between 381 and 404, decided to transfer the remains of the martyrs who had been buried in the same places as 'heretics', in order, as John Chrysostom thankfully recorded, that the people might be no longer forced

---

[48] On this concept see Cantimori (1939) and Valente (2002).

[49] Cyprian, *Ep.* 69.7; 73.2.1. Cf. Basil, *Ep.* 188.1.

[50] See Dupront (2001) 118 and Quantin (2004).

[51] August., *Ep.* 178.1: *noua quaedam haeresis inimica gratiae Christi contra ecclesiam Christi conatur exsurgere, sed nondum euidenter ab ecclesia separata est*. Curiously enough, this letter has failed to attract attention, judging by the numerous recent studies on the forerunners of the Pelagian crisis. Cf., however, *PCBE* 1 Palladius 1: the letter is effectively dated by the mention (*Ep.* 178.2) of synodal letters being sent from the Councils of Carthage and Numidia to Innocent I, the bishop of Rome 401–17 (cf. Lancel (1999) 475–76). No other identification of Augustine's correspondent, one Hilarius, has apparently been found. A parallel can be established between this text and a remark by Sozomen (2, 32, 1) about the aftermath of the Nicene Council: Τὸ δὲ Ἀρείου δόγμα, εἰ καὶ πολλοίς ἐν ταίς διαλέξεσιν ἐσπουδάζετο, οὔπω εἰς ἴδιον διεκέκριτο λαὸν ἢ ὄνομα τοῦ εὑρόντος, ἀλλὰ πάντες ἅμα ἐκκλησίαζον καὶ ἐκοινώνουν, πλὴν Ναυατιανῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων Φρυγῶν, Οὐαλεντίνων τε καὶ Μαρκιωνιστῶν καὶ Παυλιανῶν, καὶ εἴ τινες ἕτεροι ἑτέρας ἤδη ηὑρημένας αἱρέσεις ἐπλήρουν.

to pray 'in doubt and uncertainty, because they did not know where the graves of saints and the real treasures were'.[52]

The reputation of martyrs was as attractive as that of ascetics and could appeal to the faithful of any group. Sozomen liked to underline the fact that Macedonius, the anti-Nicene bishop of Constantinople, was greatly praised by the faithful on account of the way he lived.[53] Sozomen also points out how effective the behaviour of Nicene monks was in persuading the faithful to adhere to the Nicene Creed.[54] Epiphanius of Salamis, who if we are to believe Sozomen was admired for his attitude,[55] expressed a warning against the attraction that the exemplary life and the reputed orthodoxy of the followers of Apollinaris of Laodicea might exercise.[56]

To exhort the members of his congregation to behave correctly John Chrysostom emphasised the persuasive power of the βίος of the 'heretics'.[57] It is therefore easy to understand why Jerome asserted that asceticism contributed to salvation only if it was practised within the Church.[58] One also understands the reasons why the monks were praised to the skies by numerous rival dogmatic groups from the late 4th c. onwards.

To these individual instances of fascination others could be added, particularly the attraction exercised by talented preachers or debaters. Almost all the leaders of doctrinal schools were praised for their talent in the art of oratory. At the end of the 2nd c. Irenaeus of Lyons wrote about the Valentinians (without giving any further detail about the context):

---

[52] John Chrysostom, *In ascension. D. n. I. C.* 1: ὁ δὲ λαὸς ἡμίν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν ζημίαν ὑπέμεινεν ἀπὸ τῶν τόπων, τρέχων μὲν πρὸς τὰ λείψανα τῶν μαρτύρων, μετὰ δὲ ἀμφβολίας καὶ διακρίσεως ποιούμενος τὰς εὐχας διὰ τὸ ἀγνοείσθαι τὰς θήκας τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ ποῦ κείνται οἱ θησαυροὶ οἱ ἀληθινοί. Καὶ ταυτὸν ἐγίνετο, ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ ποίμνια προβάτων καθαρῶν ἀπολαῦσαι ῥείθρων ἀπειγόμενα ἔρχοιτο μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς τὰς καθαρας, βρώμου δέ ποθεν ἐγγύθεν καὶ δυσωδίας ἐμπεσούσης ἀναχαιτίζοιτο πάλιν · οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ποίμνης ταύτης συνέβαινεν. Ἐβάδιζε μὲν ὁ λαὸς πρὸς τὰς καθαρὰς τῶν μαρτύρων πηγάς · αἰσθανόμενος δὲ δυσωδίας αἱρετικῆς ἐγγύθεν ἀνιούσης, ἀνεχαιτίζετο πάλιν. On the affair of the *martyrium* of Romanesia, see Franchi De Cavalieri (1928) 152–53. Cf. Soler (2006) 203–205.

[53] Sozom. 4.27.3.

[54] Sozom. 6.20.2.

[55] Sozom. 8.14.4.

[56] Epiph., *Pan.* 77.1.1. In *Pan.* 73.35.1, Epiphanius also emphasises how Meletius of Antioch's lifestyle made him highly popular.

[57] John Chrysostom, *In Acta Apost. hom.* 47.4.

[58] Jer., *Ep.* 22.38: *Ceterum uirgines, quales apud diuersas haereses et quales apud impurissimum Manicheum esse dicuntur, scorta sunt aestimanda, non uirgines.*

> They deliver speeches to the crowds with a view to touching those who belong to the Church and whom they call "ordinary people" and "church people". Thus they capture the weak and attract them, by imitating our words so as to make people come and listen to them more often.[59]

Many testimonies confirm that 'heretics', as well as 'pagans', might attend the preaching of their opponents. This happened in Antioch when Chrysostom preached against the Anomoians;[60] the situation was similar in Constantinople when Gregory Nazianzen was a resident there.[61] Donatists and anti-Donatists would sometimes go to hear their adversaries,[62] while Origen's homilies already attracted 'heretics' to him.[63] The reputation of a talented orator was obviously enough to transcend the prejudices generated by the heresiological ethos.

This ambiguity underlines the ambivalent relationship between the logic of doctrinal rhetoric and the διαγνωστικὴ ἕξις, insofar as the rhetoric is encouraged only as long as it contributes to protecting the preacher's own followers from the opponents' seductive ways. On the other hand, all attempts are made—and are considered legitimate—to overcome resistance in the supporters of the same rival, and all the arts of persuasion may be used. This provides a natural explanation for the constant reversal of the arguments and exhortations exchanged during polemics, and highlights the need for the modern historian to consider those polemics from a structural point of view. Therefore Matthew's *logion* (Matthew 10:34–35; cf. Luke 12:51–53; 21:16) which imitates the prophet Micah (7:6) to announce the signs of the end of times—'Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's foes shall be those of his own household'—may be interpreted either with a negative value, that those who instil division within a household are 'heretics', or with a positive value, that this is the way to convert and adhere to 'the true Faith', and it is only a short step from one argument to the other.

---

[59] Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3.15.2: *Hi enim ad multitudinem propter eos, qui sunt ab ecclesia, quos communes et ecclesiasticos ipsi dicunt, inferunt sermones, per quos capiunt simpliciores, et illiciunt eos, simulantes nostrum tractatum, uti saepius audiant.* On this text see Le Boulluec (1985) 236–37 and 325.

[60] John Chrysostom, *C. Anom.* 1 and 7.

[61] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carm.* 2.1.11, vv. 1137–45; 2.1.16, vv. 39–40.

[62] August., *Serm.* 46.31; 51.6; *Serm. Dolbeau* 30.14; Possidius, *Vita Augustini* 7.3.

[63] Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* 6.18.2.

Such is the viewpoint that must be adopted to understand Augustine's address to Macrobius, the Donatist bishop of Hippo:

> People run away from unity, so that the husband may go one way and his wife the other, so that this man may say: "Preserve the unity with me, for I am your husband", and the wife may answer: "I shall die where my father is". We would hate to see them not share the same bed, and yet they do not have the same Christ! People run away from unity, so that relatives, fellow-citizens, friends and guests, all those that human preoccupations bring together, and who are attached to the same Christian faith, may agree with each other during feasts, weddings, in trade relationships, mutual contracts, compliments and conversations, only to see them part before God's altar! And yet this is the very place where all quarrels should end, whatever their cause; for, according to the Lord's commandment, one should first be reconciled with one's brethren before bringing offerings to the altar; but whereas they live in harmony everywhere else, here they stand divided.[64]

Not all the faithful had a heresiological ethos as well developed as that of the Donatist baker of Hippo who, as he was the tenant of an anti-Donatist deacon, complied with his own bishop's orders by (in Augustine's words) 'throwing to the ground the unbaked bread of his landlord, and refusing to have further dealings with him, not only in a Roman city but also in his homeland and not only in his homeland, but also in his very home, whereas the man was not sentenced to banishment'.[65]

Widows, and more generally beneficiaries of ecclesiastical assistance, could be tempted to benefit from the services of clerics belonging to a rival party. As for Gregory of Cappadocia, who had been installed in 339 as bishop of Alexandria instead of Athanasius who had been sent into exile, was he not accused of denying the right to receive alms to the destitute and the widows (that is to say those who remained faith-

---

[64] August., *Ep.* 108.17: *Fugitur unitas, ut propinqui et ciues et amici et hospites et quicumque sibi humana necessitudine conligati utrique christiani in conuiuiis ineundis, in matrimoniis tradendis et accipiendis, in emendo ac uendendo, in pactis et placitis, in salutationibus, in consensionibus, in conlocutionibus, in omnibus suis rebus negotiisque concordes sint et a dei altare discordes* (…). In *Ep.* 253 Augustine advises Benenatus, an anti-Donatist bishop, to marry off a young orphan girl of whom he is the guardian *cum domo catholica, cuius non solum nullam aduersitatem uerum etiam fidele adiutorium habere possit ecclesia.*

[65] August., *C. litt. Petiliani* 2.83.184: *Nonne apud Hipponem, ubi ego sum, non desunt qui meminerint Faustinum uestrum regni sui tempore praecepisse, quoniam catholicorum ibi paucitas erat, ut nullus eis panem coqueret, ita ut cuiusdam diaconi nostri fornarius inquilinus domnaedii sui panem incoctum abiecerit eique nulla exilii lege damnato communicationem non solum in ciuitate romana, sed etiam in patria sua, nec solum in patria sua, sed etiam in domo sua negauerit?*

ful to Athanasius), and of ordering the destruction of the containers in which they could bring home oil and wine?[66]

Implementing an heresiological ethos involved compromising with the necessities of life. If the sources give prominence to heroic illustrations of διαγνωστικὴ ἕξις, it would nonetheless be illusory to endeavour to assess the importance of, on the one hand, behaviour which complied with church discipline and, on the other hand, behaviour which did not. My purpose here was to underline the tensions that influence the lives of the faithful during times of doctrinal controversies involving large numbers of people. An apophthegm attributed to Abba Phocas and referring to an episode apparently dating from the end of the 6th c. encapsulates the uncertainties of the age. There was once a Chalcedonian monk called James, who lived in the Kellia, and who was ἀκέραιος. He was so humble that he was loved by all, whether they were followers or opponents of the Chalcedonian Creed, each group having a church of their own. The two parties would warn him against any contact with the rival group. Not knowing what to do, Abba James retired to a distant cell and spent forty days praying and fasting, prey to attacks by demons. When the forty days were over Christ appeared to him as a child and asked him to justify his behaviour. The ascetic said:

> "Lord, you know what I have. Some tell me: "Do not renounce the Church!" and the others tell me: "The Diophysites are fooling you". And I am in trouble. The reason why you see me thus is that I do not know what to do". The Lord answered: "The place where you are now is the right one for you". No sooner had he heard the words than the monk found himself before the gates of the holy church of the orthodox supporters of the council.[67]

Many, in those days, must have envied such a monk.

---

[66] Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 13.3: καὶ γὰρ καὶ χηρῶν καὶ ἄλλων ἀνεξόδων λαβόντων ἐλεημοσύνην ἐκέλευε τὰ δεδομένα διαρπάζεσθαι καὶ τὰ ἀγγεία, ἐν οἷς ἔφερον τὸ ἔλαιον καὶ τὸν οἶνον, κατάσσασθαι. A similar situation was reported in 356: cf. *Hist. Ar.* 61.2. See also, on a more positive note, August., *C. ep. Parm.* 3.2.16; *Ep.* 185.36. On the importance of the link between the poor and the bishop, see Brown (1992) 71–117 and Brown (2002).

[67] *Apophthegmata Patrum* (alphabetic collection) (PG 65.432–33), Περὶ τοῦ ἀββᾶ Φωκᾶ 1: εἶπεν αὐτῷ · Δέσποτα, σὺ γινώσκεις τί ἔχω. Ἐκείνοι λέγουσί μοι, Μὴ ἀφῇς τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν · καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι λέγουσί μοι, Πλανῶσι σε οἱ Διφυσίται. Κἀγὼ ἀπορούμενος, καὶ μὴ εἰδὼς τί δράσω, ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο. Ἀποκρίνεται αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος · Ὅπου εἶ, καλῶς εἶ. Καὶ εὐθέως σὺν τῷ λόγῳ, εὑρέθη πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας τῶν ὀρθοδόξων τῶν συνοδικῶν (mentioned by Chitty (1980) 287 and Meunier (2003) 176).

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Gérard Lorgos for his help in translating my paper into English. This contribution anticipates some developments of my forthcoming book, *Civitas confusionis. Recherches sur la participation des fidèles aux controverses doctrinales dans l'antiquité tardive*.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Acta Archelai = C. H. Benson (1906) ed. *Acta Archelai* (GCS 16) (Leipzig 1906).
Ambrose of Milan, *Exp. Ev. sec. Lucam* = G. Tissot (1971–1976) ed. and transl. *Ambroise, Traité sur l'Évangile de Luc* (SC 45bis, 52bis) (Paris 1971–1976).
Apophthegmata Patrum = *Apophthegmata Patrum, collectio alphabetica* (PG 65.71–440).
Apostolic Constitutions = M. Metzger (1985–1987) ed. and transl. *Constitutions apostoliques* (SC 320, 329, 336) (Paris 1985–1987).
Arnobius Junior, *Praed.* = F. Gori (2000) ed. *Arnobius Iunior, Praedestinatus qui dicitur* (CCSL 25/3) (Turnhout 2000).
Athanasius, *Ep. fest.* = A. Camplani (2003) transl. *Atanasio di Alessandria. Lettere festali. Anonimo. Indice delle Lettere festali* (Letture cristiane del primo millennio 34) (Milan 2003).
——, *Hist. Ar.* = H. G. Opitz (1934–1941) ed. *Athanasius, Werke* II/2 : *Die Apologien: Historia Arianorum* (Berlin 1934–1941) 183–230.
——, *Vit. Ant.* = G. J. M. Bartelink (2004) ed. and transl. *Athanase, Vie d'Antoine* (SC 400bis) (Paris 2004).
August., *C. ep. Parm.* = G. Finaert and Y. M. Congar (1963) edd. and transl. *Augustin, Contra Epistulam Parmeniani* (Bibliothèque augustinienne 28) (Paris 1963).
——, *C. litt. Petil.* = G. Finaert and B. Quinot (1967) edd. and transl. *Augustin, Contra litteras Petiliani libri tres* (Bibliothèque augustinienne 30) (Paris 1967).
——, *De unico baptismo* = G. Finaert and A. C. de Veer (1968) edd. and transl. *Augustin, Traités antidonatistes* IV (Bibliothèque Augustinienne 31) (Paris 1968) 645–737.
——, *Ep.* = A. Goldbacher (1895–1923) ed. *Augustinus, Epistulae* (CSEL 34/1–2, 44, 57–58) (Vienna 1895–1923).
——, *In Ioh. Ev. tract.* = M. F. Berrouard (1969–2003) ed. and transl. *Augustin, Homélies sur l'Évangile de saint Jean* (Bibliothèque Augustinienne 71–75) (Paris 1969–2003).
——, *Retract.* = A. Mutsenbecher (1984) ed. *Augustinus, Retractationes* (CCSL 57) (Turnhout 1984).
——, *Serm.* = M. Pellegrino *et al.* (1982–1990) edd. and transl. *Sant'Agostino, Discorsi* (Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana. Parte III: Discorsi. 29–34) (Rome 1982–1990).
——, *Serm. Dolbeau* = F. Dolbeau and V. Tarulli (2001–2002) edd. and transl. *Sant'Agostino, Discorsi nuovi* (Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana. Parte III: Discorsi. XXXV/1–2) (Rome 2001–2002).
Basil, *Ep.* = Y. Courtonne (1957–1966) ed. and transl. *Basile de Césarée, Lettres* (Paris 1957–1966).
Breviarium Hipponense = C. Munier (1974) ed. *Concilia Africae: A. 345–A. 525* (CCSL 149) 22–53.
Canons of Antioch = P. P. Joannou (1962) ed. and transl. *Discipline générale antique (IV^e–IX^e s.)* I.2, *Les canons des Synodes Particuliers* (Pontificia commissione per la redazione

del codice di diritto canonico orientale. Fonti. Fascicolo IX) (Grottaferrata 1962) 100–26.
Canons of Elvira = G. Martinez Diez and F. Rodriguez (1984) edd. *La colección canonica hispana*, IV, *Concilios galos, concilios hispanos: primera parte* (Madrid 1984) 233–68.
Canons of Laodicea = P. P. Joannou (1962) ed. and transl. *Discipline générale antique (IV^{e}–IX^{e} s.)* I.2, *Les canons des Synodes Particuliers* (Pontificia commissione per la redazione del codice di diritto canonico orientale. Fonti. Fascicolo IX) (Grottaferrata 1962) 127–55.
Cod. Theod. = R. Delmaire *et al.* (2005) edd. and transl. *Les lois religieuses des empereurs romains de Constantin à Théodose II*, I, *Code théodosien* XVI (SC 497) (Paris 2005).
Cyprian, *Ep.* = G. F. Diercks (1994–1996) ed. *Cyprianus, Epistulae* (CCSL 3 A-B) (Turnhout 1994–1996); G. W. Clarke (1984–1989) transl. *The Letters of St. Cyprian of Carthage* (ACW 43–44, 46–47) (New York 1984–1989).
——, *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate* = M. Bévenot (2006) ed. and transl. *Cyprien, L'unité de l'Église* (SC 500) (Paris 2006).
Cyril of Jerusalem, *Proc.* and *Cat.* = W. C. Reischl and J. Rupp (1848–1860) ed. *Cyrilli Hierosolymarum archiepiscopi, Opera quae supersunt omnia* (Munich 1848–1860; reprint, Hildesheim 1967).
Didascalia Apostolorum = A. Vööbus (1979) ed. and transl. *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac* (CSCO 401–402; 407–408) (Louvain 1979).
Ephraem, *Hymn. adv. haer.* = E. Beck (1957) ed. *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen contra Haereses* (CSCO 169–170) (Louvain 1957).
Epiph., *De fide* = K. Holl and J. Dummer (1985) edd. *Epiphanius, De fide* (GCS) (Berlin 1985).
——, *Pan.* = K. Holl and J. Dummer (1980–1985) edd. *Epiphanius, Panarion* (GCS) (Berlin 1980–1985).
Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* = G. Bardy (1952–1971) ed. and transl. *Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire ecclésiastique* (SC 31, 41, 55, 73) (Paris 1952–1971).
Faustinus and Marcellinus, *Libellus precum* = M. Simonetti (1967) ed. *De confessione verae fidei (Libellus precum)* (CCSL 69) (Turnhout 1967) 359–91.
Gerontius, *Vita Melaniae* = D. Gorce (1962) ed. and transl. *Gérontius, Vie de Sainte Mélanie* (SC 90) (Paris 1962); P. Laurence (2002) ed. and transl. *Gérontius. La vie latine de Sainte Mélanie* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum. Collectio minor 41) (Jerusalem 2002).
Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* = C. Moreschini (2000) ed. and transl. *Gregorio di Nazianzo. Tutte le orazioni* (Milan 2000).
——, *Carm.* = A. Tuilier, G. Bady and J. Bernardi ((2004) edd. and transl. *Grégoire de Nazianze, Oeuvres poétiques. Poèmes personnels* II, 1, 1–11 (Paris 2004).
Irenaeus of Lyons, *Adv. haer.* = A. Rousseau and L. Doutreleau (1965–1982) edd. and transl. *Irénée de Lyon, Contre les hérésies* (SC 263–264, 294, 210–211, 100, 152–153) (Paris 1965–1982).
Jer., *Ep.* = J. Labourt (1949–1963) ed. and transl. *Jérôme, Lettres* (Paris 1949–1963).
John Chrysostom, *Bapt. cat.* = A. Wenger (1985) ed. and transl. *Jean Chrysostome, Huit catéchèses baptismales inédites* (SC 50bis) (Paris 1985).
——, *C. Anom.* = A. M. Malingrey *et al.* (1970 and 1994) edd. and transl. *Jean Chrysostome, Contre les anoméens* (SC 28bis and 396) (Paris 1970 and 1994).
——, *In Act. Apost. hom.* = Johannes Chrysostomus, *In Acta Apostolorum homiliae* (PG 60.13–384.
——, *In Ascension. D. n. I. C.*. = Johannes Chrysostomus, *In Ascensionem Domini nostri Iesu Christi homilia* (PG 50.441–50).
——, *In Ep. ad Hebr.. hom.* = Johannes Chrysostomus, *In Epistulam ad Hebraeos homiliae* (PG 63.9–236).
Martyrium Pionii = L. Robert (1994) *Le martyre de Pionios, prêtre de Smyrne*, edd. G. W. Bowersock and C. P. Jones (Washington 1994).

Novum Testamentum = E. Nestle, K. Aland (1969) ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine* (London 1969[22]).
Optatus of Milevis = M. Labrousse (1995–1996) ed. and transl. *Contre les donatistes* (SC 412–413) (Paris 1995–1996).
Origen, *Hom. in Jos.* = A. Jaubert (1960) ed. and transl. *Origène, Homélies sur Josué* (SC 71) (Paris 1960).
Pacian of Barcelona, *Ep. I ad Sempronianum* = C. Granado (1995) ed. and transl. *Pacien de Barcelone, Oeuvres* (SC 410) (Paris 1995) 166–85.
Passio Donati = F. Dolbeau (1992) ed. "La 'Passio sancti Donati' (BHL 2303b). Une tentative d'édition critique", in '*Memoriam sanctorum venerantes'. Miscellanea in onore di Monsignor Victor Saxer* (Studi di antichità cristiana 48) (Vatican City 1992) 251–67.
Philostorgius = J. Bidez and F. Winkelmann (1981) edd. *Philostorgius, Kirchengeschichte* (GCS) (Berlin 1981).
Polyb. = W. R. Paton (1980) ed. and transl. *Polybius, Histories* 28–39 (Loeb Classical Library) (London 1980).
Possidius of Calama, *Vita Augustini* = A. A. R. Bastiaensen and C. Mohrmann (1975) edd. and transl. *Vita di Cipriano. Vita di Ambrogio. Vita di Agostino* (Scrittori greci e latini) (Milan 1975) 127–241.
Rufinus of Aquileia, *Hist. Eccl.* = T. Mommsen (1908) ed. *Rufinus, Historia ecclesiastica* VI–XI (GCS 9) (Berlin 1908).
Sozom. = J. Bidez and G. C. Hansen (1995) edd. *Sozomenus, Kirchengeschichte* (CGS N. F. 4) (Berlin 1995).
Synesius of Cyrene, *Ep.* = A. Garzya and D. Roques (2000) edd. and transl. *Synésios de Cyrène, Correspondance* (Paris 2000).
Tert., *Adv. Marc.* = R. Braun (2001) ed. and transl. *Tertullien, Contre Marcion* (SC 456) (Paris 2001).
Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Hom. cat.* = R. Devreesse and R. Tonneau (1949) edd. and trans. *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste* (Studi e testi 145) (Vatican City 1949).
Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Hist. eccl.* = L. Parmentier and G. C. Hansen (1998) edd. *Theodoret, Kirschengeschichte* (GCS N. F. 5) (Berlin 1998).
——, *Haer. fab. comp.* = *Theodoretus Cyrensis, Haereticarum fabularum compendium* (PG 83, col. 339–556).

Secondary Sources

Beaucamp J. (2002) "Législation et refus de(s) dieu(x) dans l'Antiquité tardive", in *Nier les dieux, nier Dieu*, ed. G. Dorival and D. Pralon (Textes et documents de la Méditerranée antique et médiévale, 2) (Aix-en-Provence 2002) 345–59.
Bévenot M. (1981) "*Salus extra ecclesiam non est* (St Cyprian)", in *'Fides sacramenti—Sacramentum fidei'. Studies in honour of Pieter Smulders*, ed. H. J. Auf Der Maur (Assen 1981) 97–105.
Bingham J. (1845) *'Origines Ecclesiasticae'. The Antiquities of the Christian Church, reprinted from the original edition 1708–1722* (London 1845).
Brown P. (1992) *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity. Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison 1992).
—— (2002) *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Hanover 2002).
Calderone S. (1962) *Costantino e il cattolicesimo* (Florence 1962; reprint Naples 2001).
Cameron Av. (2003) "How to Read Heresiology", *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33 (2003) 471–92.
Cantimori D. (1939) *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento* (Florence 1939; reprint Turin 1992).
Chitty D. (1980) *Et le désert devint une cité: une introduction à l'étude du monachisme égyptien et palestinien de l'Empire chrétien* (Spiritualité orientale 31) (Bégrolles-en-Mauge 1980).

Clark E. A. (1992) *The Origenist Controversy. The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton 1992).
Crifò G. (1999) "Considerazioni sul linguaggio religioso nelle fonti giuridiche tardo-occidentali", *Cassiodorus* 5 (1999) 123–42.
De Salvo L (1998) "Sinesio e l'amministrazione della giustizia in Cirenaica", in *La Cirenaica in età antica. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Macerata, 18–20 maggio 1995* (Ichnia, 1) (Macerata 1998) 161–75.
Douglas M. (2001) *De la souillure. Essai sur les notions de pollution et de tabou* (Paris 2001).
Dupront A. (2001) "Réflexions sur l'hérésie moderne", in *Genèses des temps modernes. Rome, les Réformes et le Nouveau Monde*, edd. D. Julia and Ph. Boutry (Paris 2001) 113–21.
Duval Y.-M. (1995) Review of Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis* in *Latomus* 54 (1995) 662–65.
Frakes R. M. (2001) *'Contra potentium iniurias': the 'defensor civitatis' and Late Roman Justice* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 90) (Munich 2001).
Franchi De Cavalieri P. (1928) "Il κοιμητήριον di Antiochia", in *Note agiografiche* 7, ed. P. Franchi De Cavalieri (Studi e Testi 49) (Rome 1928) 146–53.
Fürst A. (1999) *Augustins Briefwechsel mit Hieronymus* (Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum. Ergängzungsband 29) (Munster 1999).
—— (2002) *Augustinus-Hieronymus. Epistulae mutuae. Briefwechsel, übersetzt und eingeleitet*, (Fontes christiani 41) (Turnhout 2002).
Giardina A. (1994) "Melania, la santa", in *Roma al femminile*, ed. A. Fraschetti (Bari 1994) 259–85.
Greenslade S. L. (1964) *Schism in the Early Church*, 2nd ed. (London 1964).
Griffith S. (1999A) "Setting right the Church of Syria: Saint Ephraem's *Hymns against Heresies*", in *The Limits of Ancient Christianity. Essays on Late Antique Thought and Culture in Honor of R. A. Markus*, edd. W. Klingshirn and M. Vessey (Ann Arbor 1999) 97–114.
—— (1999B) "The marks of the 'True Church' According to Ephraem's *Hymns against Heresies*", in *After Bardaisan. Studies on Continuity and Change in Honour of Prof. H. J. W. Drijvers*, edd. G. J. Reinink and A. C. Klugkist (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 89) (Louvain 1999) 125–40.
—— (2001) "The Thorn among the Tares: Mani and Manichaeism in the Works of St. Ephraem the Syrian", *Studia Patristica* 35 (2001) 395–427.
Humfress C. (2000) "Roman Law, forensic argument and the formation of Christian orthodoxy (III–VI Centuries)", in *Orthodoxie, christianisme, histoire*, edd. S. Elm, É. Rebillard and A. Romano (Collection de l'École française de Rome 270) (Rome 2000) 125–47.
—— (2007) *Orthodoxy and the Courts in Late Antiquity* (Oxford 2007).
Kern W. (1995) "Heilsnotwendigkeit der Kirche", in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 3e éd., (Freiburg 1995) 1346–48.
Krumeich C. (1993) *Hieronymus und die christlichen* feminae clarissimae (Habelts Dissertationsdrucke. Reihe Alte Geschichte 36) (Bonn 1993).
Lancel S. (1996–2002) "*Defensor civitatis (plebis), defensor ecclesiae*", in *Augustinus-Lexikon*, t. II (Basel 1996–2002) 261–63.
—— (1999) *Saint Augustin* (Paris 1999).
Le Boulluec A. (1985) *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque (IIe–IIIe siècles)* (Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 110–11) (Paris 1985).
Ledegang F. (2001) '*Mysterium Ecclesiae'. Images of the Church and its Members in Origen* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 156) (Louvain 2001).
Lemerle P. (1945) *Philippes et la Macédoine orientale à l'époque chrétienne et byzantine. Recherches d'histoire et d'archéologie* (BEFAR 158) (Paris 1945).

Lizzi R. (1996) "La politica religiosa di Teodosio I. Miti storiografici e realtà storica", *MemLinc* ser. 9, vol. 7 (1996) 323–61.
Löhr W. (2000) "Religious truth, dissimulation, and deception in late antique Christianity", in *Double Standards in the Ancient and Medieval World*, ed. K. Pollmann (Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft. Beihefte 1) (Göttingen 2000) 287–304.
Martin A. (1996) *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'Église d'Égypte au IV^e siècle (328–373)* (Collection de l'École française de Rome 216) (Rome 1996).
Mazzarino S. (1962) *L'Impero romano* (Rome 1962).
Meunier B. (2003) *Les premiers conciles de l'Église* (Lyon 2003).
Monceaux P. (1912) *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'à l'invasion arabe*, t. IV: *Le donatisme* (Paris 1912).
Noethlichs K. L. (1971) *Die gesetzgeberischen Massnahmen der christlichen Kaiser des vierten Jahrhunderts gegen Häretiker, Heiden und Juden*, Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität zu Köln (Cologne 1971).
O'Connell R. J. (1987) *The Origin of the Soul in St. Augustine's Writings* (New York 1987).
Paoli E. (1994) "Autour de Paula (347–404): *subsidia prosopographica*", *ZPE* 103 (1994) 241–49.
Parker R. (1983) *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford 1983).
PCBE 1 = *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, I. *Afrique (303–533)*, ed. A. Mandouze (Paris 1982).
PCBE 2 = Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire, II. *Italie (313–604)*, edd. C. Pietri and L. Pietri (Rome 1999–2000).
Pekáry T. (1973) Review of Noethlichs, *Die gesetzgeberischen* Massnahmen in *Gymnasium* 80 (1973) 561–63.
Penn M. (2003) "Ritual kissing, heresy and the emergence of early Christian orthodoxy", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 54 (2003) 625–40.
—— (2005) *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church* (Philadelphia 2005).
Perrin M. Y. (2001) "À propos de la participation des fidèles aux controverses doctrinales dans l'antiquité tardive: considérations introductives", *AnTard* 9 (2001) 179–99.
Pietri C. (1976) '*Roma Christiana*'. *Recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311–440)* (BEFAR 224) (Rome 1976).
—— (1997A) "Constantin en 324: propagande et théologie impériales d'après les documents de la *Vita Constantini*", in '*Christiana Respublica*'. *Éléments d'une enquête sur le christianisme antique* (Collection de l'École française de Rome 234) (Rome 1997) 253–80.
—— (1997B) "Damase et Théodose. Communion orthodoxe et géographie politique", in '*Christiana Respublica*'. *Éléments d'une enquête sur le christianisme antique* (Collection de l'École française de Rome 234) (Rome 1997) 347–54.
—— (1997C) "La politique de Constance II: un premier 'césaropapisme' ou l'*imitatio Constantini*", in '*Christiana Respublica*'. *Éléments d'une enquête sur le christianisme antique* (Collection de l'École française de Rome 234) (Rome 1997) 281–346.
Pietri C. and Pietri L. (1995) *Histoire du christianisme*, t. II: *Naissance d'une chrétienté (250–430)* (Paris 1995).
Quantin J.–L. (2004) "Le rêve de la communauté pure: sur le rigorisme comme phénomène européen" *Francia* 31 (2004) 1–24.
Rahner H. (1964) *Symbole der Kirche: die Ekklesiologie der Väter* (Salzburg 1964).
Ratzinger J. (1971) *Le nouveau peuple de Dieu* (Paris 1971).
Rebenich S. (1992) *Hieronymus und sein Kreis. Prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Historia. Einzelschriften 72) (Stuttgart 1992).

Russell P. S. (1994) *St. Ephraem the Syrian and St. Gregory the Theologian Confront the Arians* (Môrân 'Ethô 5) (Kottayam 1994).

Schmitt T. (1998) "Neue Quellen zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Synesios und Andronikos? Die zwei Versionen von Syn. ep. 42 Garzya und Basil. ep. 61", *RhM* 141 (1998) 379–92.

Schwartz E. (1921) "Über die Reichskonzilien von Theodosius bis Justinian", *ZSav* 11 (1921) 208–53, reprinted in *Gesammelte Schriften*, IV, *Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche und ihres Rechts* (Berlin 1960) 111–58.

Simonetti M. (1963) "Appunti per una storia dello scisma luciferiano", in *Atti del Convegno di studi religiosi sardi. Cagliari, 24–26 maggio 1962* (Padua 1963) 67–81.

—— (2001) "Lucifero di Cagliari nella controversia ariana", in *La figura e l'opera di Lucifero di Cagliari. Una rivisitazione. Atti del I Convegno Internazionale Cagliari, 5-dicembre 1996*, ed. S. Laconi (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 75) (Rome 2001) 9–28.

Smith W. and Cheetham S. (1876) edd. *A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities Being A Continuation of 'the Dictionary of the Bible'* (London 1876).

Soler E. (2006) *Le sacré et le salut à Antioche au IV^e s. ap. J.-C. Pratiques festives et comportements religieux dans le processus de christianisation de la cité* (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 176) (Beyrouth 2006).

Teja R. (1997) "Sinesio de Cirene y el derecho de asilo en las iglesias. A propósito de un libro reciente" *Cassiodorus* 3 (1997) 237–46.

Thébert Y. (2003) *Thermes romains d'Afrique du Nord et leur contexte méditerranéen* (BEFAR 315) (Rome 2003).

Tilley M. A. (2007) "When schism becomes heresy: developing doctrinal deviance in the wounded body", *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15 (2007) 1–21.

Vaggione R. P. (2000) *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution* (Oxford 2000).

Valente M. (2002) "Un sondaggio sulla prassi cattolica del nicodemismo. 'Che li scolari tedeschi si debbano tollerare a vivere luteranamente, in secreto però' ", in *Cinquant'anni di storiografia italiana sulla Riforma e i movimenti ereticali in Italia 1950–2000* (Torino 2002) 175–216.

Végh Z. (1972) Review of Noethlichs, *Die gesetzgeberischen Mazssnahmen* in *ZSav* 89 (1972) 457–64.

Wipszycka E. (1996) "Καθολικὴ et les autres épithètes qualifiant le nom ἐκκλησία: contribution à l'étude de l'ordre hiérarchique des églises dans l'Égypte byzantine", in *Études sur le christianisme dans l'Égypte de l'antiquité tardive* (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 52) (Rome 1996) 157–75.